

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were examined and stand rejected. In response, no claims are amended, no claims are cancelled, and no claims are added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending Claims 1-20 in view of at least the following remarks and amendments.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al., U.S. Patent 6,996,677 (herein after referred to as "Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding Claims 1 and 15, Claims 1 and 15 recite "saving a return address in a first stack and in a second stack at the same time, the return address containing an instruction to be executed after execution of the called function" as well as "determining if the return address stored in the first stack matches the return address stored in the second stack to provide protection from a buffer overflow attack." These features to provide protection from a buffer overflow attack were conceived in the United States at least as early as October 18, 2002, as evidenced by the Invention Disclosure Form and the "LT Stack Protection" document accompanying the Declarations of the inventor under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, which are submitted to the patent Office in conjunction with this response to the Office Action mailed May 30, 2007.

Applicants respectfully submit the October 18, 2002 conception date precedes the priority date of Lee of November 25, 2002. In view of the 1.131 Declarations submitted herewith, Lee cannot properly be cited against the pending claims. Accordingly, since Lee cannot be properly cited against the pending claims, Applicants respectfully request the Patent Office withdraw the §102(e) rejection of independent Claims 1 and 15.

Regarding Claims 2-5 and 16, Claims 2-5 and 16 based on their dependency from Claims 1 and 15, respectively, for at least the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 1 and 15 cannot be anticipated by Lee.

Regarding independent Claims 6 and 17, Claims 6 and 17 recite saving a return address in a first stack and in a second stack at the same time, the return address being an address at which program execution is to resume after execution of a called function as well as comparing the return addresses saved in the first and second stack upon execution of the called function. Claims 7, 8 and 18 depend from Claims 6 and 17, respectively.

Independent Claims 6 and 17 are also supported by the conception date of October 18, 2002 as evidenced by the affidavits of the inventors under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, submitted herewith. Accordingly, similar to independent Claims 1 and 15, Lee cannot be properly cited against independent Claims 6 and 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 6-8 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Lee.

Regarding independent Claims 9 and 19, independent Claims 9 and 19 recite passing control of the program to an exception handler if the return address stored in the first stack does not match the return address stored in the second stack upon execution of the called function to provide protection from a buffer overflow attack. Claims 18 and 20 depend from Claims 9 and 19, respectively. These claims are entitled to the date of conception of October 18, 2002 as supported by the affidavits filed by the inventors under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, as provided herewith.

Therefore, Lee cannot be properly cited against Claims 9-10 and 19-20. Consequently, since Lee cannot be properly cited against Claims 9-10 and 19-20, Applicants respectfully

request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection of Claims 9-10 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Lee.

Regarding Claims 11 and 13, Claims 11 and 13 recite buffer overflow control logic to determine if the return address retrieved from the first memory locations matches the return address retrieved from the second memory locations, upon execution of the called function to provide protection from a buffer overflow attack. Claims 12-14 depend from Claims 11 and 13, respectively.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11 and 13, as well as dependent Claims 12 and 14 are entitled to the October 18, 2002 conception date as supported by the affidavits filed by the inventors under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131.

Hence, for at least the reasons indicated above, Lee cannot be properly cited against Claims 11-12 and 13-14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Patent Office withdraw the rejection of Claims 11-12 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Lee.


RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 30 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.


Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 8/30/07 By: 
Joseph Lutz, Reg. No. 43,765

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

 8/30/07
Elaine Kwak Date